

0057.0048

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/539,644

Examiner: Ann J. Chempakaseril

First Named Application: U.HANNSMANN et al.

Art Unit: 2166

Status of Application: After Final

**Tentative Participants:**

(1) David W. Victor

(2) Ann J. Chempakaseril

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Proposed Date of Interview:** N/A**Proposed Time:** N/A**Type of Interview Requested:**(1)  Telephonic (2)  Personal (3)  Video ConferenceExhibit to be shown or demonstrated:  Yes  No  
If yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

### Issues to be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) Rej. 103	1, 39, 40	Remer & Aburri			

 Continuation Sheet Attached**Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:**

Sec. 103: With respect to claim 1 want to discuss why cited para. 77 of Remer does not teach the claim requirement of the file comprising the licensing information, which as amended recites receiving, from the server, a file comprising license information and a locator for the content data, wherein the license information indicates a license status enabling the client to access the content data, wherein the license status indicates available content usage, wherein the available content usage indicates an amount of the content available to the client according to a scope of a license. The cited para. 77 discusses an interaction of a POS (point of service) computer and a servicing component. The servicing component pings the POS computer to retrieve the current POS license and verifies that the digital signature of the POS license is valid. The service agent collects a copy of a new POS license into a discovery database. If there is an existing license with the same Node ID, the service agent must synchronize the retrieved POS license with the existing license in the discovery database. Nowhere does the cited para. 77 teach or suggest the claim requirement of receiving a license file indicating available content usage, wherein the available content usage indicates an amount of the content available to the client according to a scope of a license.

Want to discuss Examiner Response to Arguments. The Examiner mentions that Aburri discloses licenses in a license store, and then provides an example if a license only allows a predetermined number of renderings, citing col. 17, lines 55-69, and that the store 540 of Aburri would have to teach a number of rendering have taken place. (FOA, pg. 2) However, the example the examiner provides is not actually taught or suggested in the cited Aburri. The cited col. 17 mentions that a license stores licenses received by the digital rights management (DRM) system. The license store may be a subdirectory of a drive such as a hard disk or network drive. This license store 38 is in the user's computing device, and an enforcement architecture in the user computing device 14 specifies license rules that must be satisfied before digital content can be rendered. (Aburri, col. 6, lines 40-56). Nowhere does this cited col. 17 teach or suggest the examiner "example" of a predetermined number of renderings or decrementing this predetermined. Further, the cited Aburri does not teach or suggest decrementing the available content usage included in the file sent to the client by an amount of actual client usage of the content data at the client in response to providing access to the content data. In fact, the cited col. 58 of Aburri teaches away from this requirement because in Aburri the license has an expiration date, expiry date, and would have no need to decrement an available content usage in the file. Aburri's license expires based on the date, not on the actual client usage. Thus, Aburri's technique for requiring periodic updating of the expiration date teaches away from the claim requirement of decrementing the available content usage included in the file sent to the client by an amount of actual client usage of the content data at the client in response to providing access to the content data.

May also want to discuss claim 40, 63, and 64.

/David Victor/  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)